

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada (US 6,522,079) in view of Kijima et al. (US 6,259,500).

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Kijima et al. and Fukuyoshi et al. (US 6,249,082)

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claim 5 contains allowable subject matter.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for courtesies extended to Applicants' Representative during the telephone interview conducted on August 23, 2004.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 19, and 21 to further define the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 1-21 remain pending in this application for further consideration.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Kijima et al., and claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Kijima et al. and Fukuyoshi et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Presently-amended independent claim 1 recites, at least a feature of "an absorber contained within each groove at least to remove water in the electroluminescence display device." In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, none of Yamada, Kijima et al., and

Fukuyoshi et al., whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest an absorber contained within each groove at least to remove water in the electroluminescence display device.

For example, the Final Office Action concedes that Yamada “fails to teach specifically an absorber contained with in each protrusion,” but alleges that “Kijima et al. teaches specifically an absorber contained with in each protrusion (Col. 11, Lines 38-50, Col. 12, lines 14-17, Col. 12, Lines 9-13,...).” Applicants respectfully disagree.

It appears that the Final Office Action suggests that the plurality of minute protrusions 14a’ and 14b’ disclosed by Yamada correspond to the “absorbers,” as presently claimed. In Applicants’ previous Response filed on May 3, 2004, Applicants presented arguments that Kijima et al. actually discloses an electrode 31a having a plurality of minute protrusions 14a’ and 14b’ of different heights. Thus, Applicants maintain that the protrusions 14a’ and 14b’ of Yamada are part of the electrode 31a, and do not serve to remove water from within the display device. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Kijima et al. is completely silent with respect to the above-mentioned features of Applicants’ claimed invention.

For similar reasons as those set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Yamada, Kijima et al., and Fukuyoshi et al., whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest “an absorber contained within each of the plurality of grooves at least to remove water in the electroluminescence display device,” as recited by presently-amended independent claim 13, wherein “each absorber contained within each of the plurality of grooves at least to remove water in the electroluminescence display device,” as recited by presently-amended independent claim 19.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-21 are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: August 25, 2004

**Customer No. 09629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202-739-3000